



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/845,948	04/30/2001	Tatsuo Itabashi	112857-222	3323

29175 7590 05/24/2005

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD, LLC  
P. O. BOX 1135  
CHICAGO, IL 60690-1135

EXAMINER
----------

KIM, JUNG W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2132

DATE MAILED: 05/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/845,948

Applicant(s)

ITABASHI, TATSUO

Examiner

Jung W. Kim

Art Unit

2132

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 30 April 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: 1, 3-8, 10-12, 14-20 and 22-28.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

  
GILBERTO BARRON JR.  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

In reply to applicant's argument that Davis does not anticipate claims 14, 15 and 18 because Davis does not disclose transmitting and verifying terminal identification information (Remarks, pg. 16, 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph); these features are not considered because these features upon which applicant relies are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Regarding applicant's argument that Davis "teaches away from an internet payment system that verifies and certifies the signature that provides verification of the transaction" (Remarks, pg. 17, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph), it is not clear how applicant maintains such a conclusion based on the premise that Davis teaches an optional step for delivering an expected card signature to the payment server and an optional step of the payment server delivering the expected card signature to the client terminal or merchant server for comparison. Contrary to Applicant's argument, Davis discloses verification and certification of a store-value card signature is essential to verify a client transaction. (col. 17:35-18:9)

Applicant further argues Walker teaches against the combinability of the art. (Remarks, pg. 17, 3<sup>rd</sup>-4<sup>th</sup> paragraphs) It is noted that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the Walker reference teaches secure communication of information between a device and a means to securely read out information stored in the device. Particularly, Walker discloses adding to transmitted messages from the device: "unique device IDs, challenges-response protocols, digital certificates, combinations of symmetric and asymmetric (public key) encryption, and many other cryptographic techniques, in patterns appropriate to the particular application at hand" col. 4:37-42. Implicit in this teaching is the ability of one of ordinary skill in the art to take such features and apply it to a message depending on the context of the message; moreover, implied in the teaching is that the step of adding a device id to a message is a well known security modification to secure transmitted messages.

Regarding applicant's argument that Claus does not teach "a first card holding device capable of holding data containing personal information identifying at least users" and "a second data holding device capable of holding data containing information identifying providers which provide at least products or services" (Remarks, pg. 18, last paragraph-pg. 19, first paragraph); examiner respectfully disagrees and again points to Figure 1 and related text as well as col. 2:44-57; 3 possible card holders are identified: merchant, bank or consumer.

Applicant's argument that it is improper to combine Claus and Davis since Davis teaches away from Claus (pg. 20, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph) is not persuasive: the security locking feature of Claus and the transaction feature of Davis are not mutually exclusive; having one feature does not necessarily exclude the other.

Finally, applicant's argument that the modification of Claus in view of Walker is improper (pg. 20, last paragraph-pg. 21, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph) is based on the same premise that Walker does not teach an analogous art as the primary reference. This argument has been addressed above.

Continuation of 7. The objections to claim 28 and the Specification are withdrawn

*R* 5/19/05